

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

TROY WILLIAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:14CV00434 ERW
)	
NANCY KASSEBAUM,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the application of Troy Williams for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the application, plaintiff will be granted in forma pauperis status. In addition, and for the reasons stated below, the Court will dismiss this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is

undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right. *Spencer v. Rhodes*, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), *aff'd* 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include "legal conclusions" and "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements." *Id.* at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 1950-51. This is a "context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense." *Id.* at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the "mere possibility of misconduct." *Id.* The Court must review the factual allegations in the complaint "to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief." *Id.* at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court

may exercise its judgment in determining whether plaintiff's conclusion is the most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. *Id.* at 1950, 51-52.

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

The Complaint

Plaintiff, a resident at the Northwest Missouri Psychiatric Rehabilitation Center, brings this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action Nancy Kassebaum (a former senator for the State of Kansas).

Plaintiff alleges that, when he resided at the Farmington State Hospital in 1995, he wrote to defendant Kassebaum about his idea to cure numerous diseases. Plaintiff states that he sent defendant his “feet spray formula,” but afterwards, a man with herpes entered his room and “made [plaintiff] release his idea without a patent.” Plaintiff goes on to make other unintelligible allegations about the advertising of the foot spray, and he asks the Court to “tell Nancy Kassebaum she can keep all proceeds.”

Although a pro se complaint is to be liberally construed, the complaint must contain a short and plain summary of facts sufficient to give fair notice of the claim

asserted. *Means v. Wilson*, 522 F.2d 833, 840 (8th Cir. 1975). The Court will not supply additional facts or construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded. Having carefully reviewed the complaint, the Court concludes that plaintiff's factual allegations are delusional and fail to state a claim or cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed, without prejudice.


Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint, because it is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

So Ordered this 12th day of March, 2014.



E. RICHARD WEBBER
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE